UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/511,313	04/19/2005	Shunichi Shiokawa	0002.1008	6609
21171 STAAS & HAL	7590 10/15/200 SEY LLP	EXAMINER		
SUITE 700	DV AVENDE NIW	OAKES, DEVIN RAE		
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			4185	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/15/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/511,313	SHIOKAWA ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Devin Oakes	4185			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 Ag This action is FINAL . 2b)☑ This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 4/19/2005 is/are: a) ☐ a Applicant may not request that any objection to the or	r election requirement. r. accepted or b)∐ objected to by t				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex-		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		, tollon on lond 1 to 1 to 2			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/15/2004.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate			

Application/Control Number: 10/511,313 Page 2

Art Unit: 4185

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 1 and 6 are objected to as being product by process claims. For the purpose of this office action the product was considered to be the primary invention. As "In order to be patentable a product must be novel, useful, and unobvious. This is true whether the product is claimed by describing it or by listing process steps used to obtain it." In re Brown, 173 USPQ 685,688 (CCPA 1972)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 3. Claims 2 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The measurement "15 points and above" is not defined well enough that a person of ordinary skill in the art

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

Application/Control Number: 10/511,313 Page 3

Art Unit: 4185

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-3 and 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kewpie K.K. (Japanese Utility Model Application No. 167994/84).

Regarding claims 1-3 and 6-8, Kewpie K.K. discloses a multilayer packaging bag in which the seal state is confirmed using light and wherein the seal state confirming part is a transparent part (page 3, line 10 to page 7, line 15; international preliminary examination report).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. Claims 4, 5, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kewpie K.K. in view of Ajinomoto Co Inc (JP 2000-7047).

Kewpie K.K.'s invention discloses all of the claimed limitations from above except for the odor barrier layer and the impact resistive layer.

However Ajinomoto Co Inc teaches a bag/material having an odor ingredients barrier layer and/or an impact resistive layer (Page 4, Lines 9-13 and Page 4, Lines 38-45).

10. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kewpie K.K.'s invention to include the odor ingredients barrier layer and/or the impact resistive layer as taught in Ajinomoto Co Inc, since doing so would provide impact resistance and/or odor elimination to the bag/material.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Toyo Seikan Kaisha, Ltd. (JP 48-9908), Dainippon Printing Co.,

Application/Control Number: 10/511,313 Page 5

Art Unit: 4185

Ltd. (JP 10-305513), Toyo Seikan Kaisha, Ltd. (JP 61-33956), Armitage (US 5,260,766).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Devin Oakes whose telephone number is (571)270-7111. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 9:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrell McKinnon can be reached on (571)272-4797. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Devin Oaks/

October 14, 2008
/Terrell L Mckinnon/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4185

Application/Control Number: 10/511,313

Page 6

Art Unit: 4185